(c) what was the bulk drug.price taken into account for working out the formulation price;

(d) whether IDPL sold any quantity to non-associated formulators; and

(e) if so, what are the details" thereof indicating the name of the party, the quantity and the price charged?

THE MINISTER OF CHEMICALS. AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL): (a) IDPL have not installed any capacity for the commercial manufacture of Glybanclamide. However, in course of Research and Dievelopment work in-house, certain quantity was produced and used.

(b) and (c) IDPL marketed the formulation under brand name of 'Idimide' based on Glybenclamide. The strength is 5 mg/tablet. IDPL follows the leader price of Rs. 6.65 (including excise duty) fixed for a pack of 10x10 tablets.

(d) and (e) As the IDPL did not undertake commercial production of Glybenclamide bulk, the question of sale of the same to any non-associated formulator does not arise.

Association of Multinationals or Non-resident Indains with construction of fertilizer plants

2308. SHRI K. VASUDEVA PANICKER: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to state-

i(a) whether! « any multinational firm or non-resident Indians are associated with the setting up of new fertilizer units under erection; and

(b) if so, what are the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL): (a) and (b) M/s. Caparo Group, London, has offered to set up a gas-based fertilizer project at Shahjahanpur in U.P., at an estimated cost of Rs. 620 crores, with 50 per cent of the equity as nonresident Indian investment.

Manufacture of drugs of doubtful validity

2309. SHRI RAJNI RANJAN SAHU: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 2826 given in the Rajya Sabha o_n the 22nd August, 1983 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the manufacturers are increasing production of formulations of doubtful validity which are exempted from price control;

(b) whether it is **a** fact that Government neither allowed re.endorse-ment nor instructed the companies to stop production;

(c) what was the production of each product for the previous three years, year-wise, as mentioned in the application for re-endorsement of capacity by each company and what was their production during 1984-85;

(d) what are the names of the formulations of each company of doubtful validity, based on imported and canalised bulk drugs;

(e) what was the consumption of each drug by each company during 1979-80 and 1984-85;

(f) what are the reasons for not putting restriction on their imports and allocations of canalised drugs;

(g) whether it is also a fact that companies are marketing without price approval and overcharging and expanding production unauthorjsed-ly; and

(h) if so, what action was taken against them?